



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/843,682	04/27/2001	Duane L. Porter	Sprint 1616 (4000-04200)	2133

21396 7590 06/04/2004

STEVEN J. FUNK
6450 SPRINT PARKWAY
MS: KSOPHN0312 3A371
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251

EXAMINER

ANYA, CHARLES E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2004

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/843,682

Applicant(s)

PORTER ET AL.

Examiner

Charles E Anya

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/21/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-23 are pending in this application.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 6 and 7 objected to because of the following informalities:

The phrase "[need to define in specification]" in claims 6 and 7 make the claims unclear. For the purpose of this office action the examiner would delete the said phrase "[need to define in specification]".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. **Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

5. Claim 1 recites the limitations "the extraction, transformation, and adaptation steps (a)-(c), respectively", "the extraction, transformation, and adaptation steps", and "unwrapping, mapping, transformation, and loading steps (d)-(h), respectively" in lines 16,17 and 19-20 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2126

For the purpose of this office action the examiner would change the phrases "the extraction, transformation, and adaptation steps (a)-(c), respectively", "the extraction, transformation, and adaptation steps", and "unwrapping, mapping, transformation, and loading steps (d)-(h), respectively" to "the extracting, the transforming, and the wrapping steps (a)-(c), respectively", "the extracting, the transforming, and the wrapping steps", and "the unwrapping, the mapping, the transforming, and the loading steps (d)-(h), respectively" respectively.

6. Claim 21 recites the limitation "the process" in line 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

For the purpose of this office action the examiner would change the phrase " the process" to "the method for delivering information".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 1-10 and 17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,714,979 B1 to Brandt et al. in view of E.P.O. Pat. No. EP 1,016,989 A2 to Yee et al.**

9. As to claim 1, Brandt teaches a method for delivering information within a computing environment, comprising: (a) extracting information from an information source (Extract Process 500 Col. 14 Ln. 57 – 61), (b) transforming extracted information (Harvesting Component 600 Col. 14 Ln. 61 – 65), (d) routing the message envelope to at least one information target (Col. 14 Ln. 57 – 67), (f) mapping the received information to a format required by the information target (figure 8 Col. 17 Ln. 22 – 24, Col. 23 Ln. 45 – 47), (g) transforming the received information (Col. 24 Ln. 1 – 10), and (h) loading the received information into the information target (Process 465 Col. 14 Ln. 66 – 67, Col. 15 Ln. 1 – 10, Col. 18 Ln. 7 – 19, Col. 22 Ln. 25 – 41), wherein the extracting, and the transforming steps (a)-(b), respectively, are isolated from the routing step (d) such that the extracting and the transforming steps may be executed simultaneously for a plurality information sources distributed across the computing environment to produce a plurality of message envelopes and wherein the routing, the mapping, the transforming, and the loading steps (d)-(h), respectively, are repeated for each of the plurality of message envelopes (“...parallel processing...” Col. 24 Ln. 19 – 22).

10. Brandt is silent with respect to wrapping the transformed information into a message envelope having a standard format and unwrapping the message envelope to reveal the information received.

11. Yee teaches wrapping the transformed information into a message envelope having a standard format (Source Adapter 222 page 13 paragraph 0155) and

unwrapping the message envelope to reveal the information received (Target Adapter 224 page 14 paragraph 0171).

12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Yee and Brandt because the teaching of Yee would have improved the system of Brandt by providing a means for sending and propagating messages across varying platforms.

13. As to claim 2, Brandt teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the information is pulled from the source during the extracting step (a) (Extract Process 500 Col. 14 Ln. 57 – 61).

14. As to claim 3, Brandt teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the information is pushed from the source during the extracting step (a) (Col. 16 Ln. 14 – 35).

15. As to claim 4, Brandt teaches method of claim 1 wherein the information extracted during step (a) comprises content changes to the source information at the time step (a) is performed as compared to the source information at a previous point in time (Col. 19 Ln. 65 – 67, Col. 20 Ln. 1 – 2).

16. As to claim 5, Brandt teaches the method of claim 1 wherein transforming the extracted information during step (b) to further comprising applying one or more

business rules to modify the extracted information (Col. 14 Ln. 61 – 64, Col. 18 Ln. 13 – 17).

17. As to claim 6, Brandt teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the message envelope further comprises an identification of the information source, a content definition identification and the content of the transformed information (figure 10 Col. 20 Ln. 10 – 34).

18. As to claim 7, Brandt teaches method of claim 6 wherein the content definition identification is used to retrieve the content definition from a metadata repository (figure 10 Col. 20 Ln. 10 – 34).

19. As to claim 8, Yee teaches the method of claim 6 wherein wrapping the message envelope further comprising retrieving content definition from a metadata repository and applying the content definition to the transformed information to produce a content message envelope (page 14 paragraph 0170).

20. As to claim 9, Yee teaches method of claim 6 further comprising, placing the message envelope into an inbox queue to a router component for routing according to step (d) (page 13 paragraph 0160).

21. As to claim 10, Yee teaches to the method of claim 9, wherein the information sources publish the message envelope to the inbox queue and the router component subscribes to the inbox queue (page 12 paragraph 0143, page 13 paragraph 0160).
22. As to claim 17, Yee teaches the method of claim 8 wherein unwrapping the message envelope further comprising retrieving content definition from the metadata repository and applying the content definition to the message envelope to reveal the transformed information (page 14 paragraph 0171).
23. As to claim 18, Yee teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising after unwrapping the message envelope, filtering the transformed information prior to loading the transformed information (page 16 paragraph 0188-0196).
24. As to claim 19, Brandt teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising after unwrapping the message envelope, aggregating a plurality of transformed information and loading the aggregation of transformed information into the information target as a batch (Col. 24 Ln. 1 – 7).
25. As to claim 20, Brandt teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the information target comprises a data warehouse and a data mart (Col. 15 Ln. 1 – 6).

26. As to claim 21, Brandt teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the method for delivering information is executed on a plurality of computing platforms within the computing environment ("...parallel processing..." Col. 24 Ln. 20 – 23).

27. As to claim 22, Yee teaches the method of claim 21 wherein the plurality, of computing platform comprise information domains for an enterprise (figure 1a page 7 paragraph 0057).

28. As to claim 23, see the rejection of claim 1.

29. Claims 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,714,979 B1 to Brandt et al. in view of E.P.O. Pat. No. EP 1,016,989 A2 to Yee et al. as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,704,768 B1 to Zombek et al.

30. As to claim 11, Brandt and Yee as modified are silent with reference to the method of claim 10 further comprising retrieving the message envelope from the inbox queue, looking up the address of the information target in a cross-reference table, and transmitting the message envelope to the information target.

31. Zombek teaches the method of claim 10 further comprising retrieving the message envelope from the inbox queue, looking up the address of the information

target in a cross-reference table, and transmitting the message envelope to the information target (Col. 21 Ln. 39 – 50).

32. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Zombek, Brandt and Yee because the teaching of Zombek would improve the system of Brandt and Yee by providing source authentication (Col. 21 Ln. 39 – 50).

33. As to claim 12, Zombek teaches the method of claim 11 wherein looking up the address of the information target is cross-referenced by the identity of the information source (Col. 22 Ln. 38 – 42).

34. As to claim 13, Zombek teaches the method of claim 12 wherein the cross-reference table resides in local memory within the router component (Col. 21 Ln. 39 – 50).

35. As to claim 14, Yee teaches the method of claim 11 wherein transmitting the message envelope comprises placing the message envelope into an information target queue (page 13 paragraph 0160).

36. As to claim 15, Yee teaches the method of claim 14 wherein the router component publishes the message envelope to the outbox queue and the information target subscribes to the outbox queue (page 15 paragraph 0185 and 0186).

37. As to claim 16, Yee teaches the method of claim 15 wherein the message envelope is retrieved from the outbox queue prior to unwrapping the message envelope (page 14 paragraph 0170).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E Anya whose telephone number is (703) 305-3411. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00) First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, An Meng-Ai can be reached on (703) 305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Charles E Anya
Examiner
Art Unit 2126

cea.


MENG-AI T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100